

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUN 22 2009

Amendments to the Claims:

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions, and listings, of claims in the application:

Listing of Claims:

Claim 1 (withdrawn): A method for detecting attempted intrusions in a database application, the method comprising:

monitoring for an SQL statement, said SQL statement executable in said database application and intended to exploit a vulnerability;

actuating said SQL statement to discover an atomic SQL command;

analyzing said atomic SQL command against a pre-defined set of detection rules.

Claim 2 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 1, wherein said vulnerability is a buffer overflow in a SQL procedure.

Claim 3 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 1, wherein said vulnerability is a buffer overflow in a call from SQL to an operating system function.

Claim 4 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 1, wherein said vulnerability is an attempt to escalate privileges of a user in said database application.

Claim 5 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 1, wherein said vulnerability is an attempt to escalate privileges within an operating system.

Claim 6 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 1, wherein said vulnerability is an attempt to insert an invasive SQL statement into a parameter of stored procedures.

Claim 7 (withdrawn): A method for detecting an anomalous command in a database application, the method comprising:

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

actuating said database application in order to discover a form of a set of authorized SQL statements and commands and to discover appropriate parameters for said statements and commands;

generating a rule set of said discovered form of said authorized SQL statements;

monitoring for SQL statements executable in said database application which do not match said generated rule set of forms of authorized SQL statements.

Claim 8 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 7, wherein said anomalous command is a SELECT statement.

Claim 9 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 7, wherein said anomalous command is an UPDATE statement.

Claim 10 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 7, wherein said anomalous command is an INSERT statement.

Claim 11 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 7, wherein said anomalous command is a DELETE statement.

Claim 12 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 7, wherein said anomalous command is a call to a stored procedure.

Claim 13 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 7, wherein said anomalous command is a batch script.

Claim 14 (withdrawn): A method for detecting attempts to access a database application from invalid sources, the method comprising:

actuating said database application in order to discover a normal set of authorized SQL sources;

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

generating a rule set of characteristics of connecting at least one of said normal set of SQL sources;

monitoring for SQL statements executable in said database application which do not match said generated rule set of valid forms for authorized SQL statements.

Claim 15 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 14, wherein a characteristic of said rule set is based on a location of an SQL source.

Claim 16 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 14, wherein a characteristic of said rule set is based on a network address of an SQL source.

Claim 17 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 14, wherein a characteristic of said rule set is based on a host name of an SQL source.

Claim 18 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 14, wherein a characteristic of said rule set is based on a domain name of an SQL source.

Claim 19 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 14, wherein a characteristic of said rule set is based on a time of activity of an SQL source.

Claim 20 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 14, wherein a characteristic of said rule set is based on an application name of an SQL source.

Claim 21 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 14, wherein a characteristic of said rule set is based on a behavior of an SQL source.

Claims 22 – 30 (cancelled)

Claim 31 (withdrawn): A method for detecting activity designed to breach security of a database application, the method comprising:

monitoring for discrete events executable in said database application and intended to breach a security mechanism associated with said database application;

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

actuating each discrete database event;

analyzing said database events against a pre-defined set of detection rules.

Claim 32 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 31, wherein said activity is a brute-force guessing of usernames in said database application.

Claim 33 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 31, wherein said activity is the brute-force guessing of usernames and passwords for default accounts in said database application.

Claim 34 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 31, wherein said activity is the brute-force guessing of usernames and passwords for well-known accounts in said database application.

Claim 35 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 31, wherein said activity is the scripting of password guessing against the database application.

Claim 36 (withdrawn): A method for detecting suspicious activity in a database application, the method comprising:

monitoring for SQL statements executable in said database application which contain characteristics indicative of an attack;

actuating each batch statement in order to discover atomic SQL commands;

analyzing said atomic SQL commands against a pre-defined set of rules to identify said suspicious activity.

Claim 37 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 36, wherein said suspicious activity is a use of comments within an SQL statement.

Claim 38 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 36, wherein said suspicious activity is a use of a UNION keyword within an SQL statement.

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

Claim 39 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 36, wherein said suspicious activity is a use of a keyword designed to suppress auditing data.

Claim 40 (withdrawn): A method for detecting use of keywords to suppress auditing of attacks in a database application, the method comprising:

- monitoring for SQL statements that contain a keyword, where said keyword results in audit data being suppressed;
- detecting a suppressed SQL statement;
- detecting a conclusion of said suppressed SQL statement;
- determining that no execution of said keyword designed to suppress said SQL statement actually occurred.

Claim 41 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 40, further comprising a use of passwords designed to cause an auditing system to suppress text of said SQL statement and masking malicious activity.

Claim 42 (withdrawn): A host-based intrusion prevention method for blocking attacks on database applications, the method comprising:

- detecting an attack occurring through a session with said database application;
- identifying a source of said attack;
- implementing a method of stopping said attack source;
- implementing a method of preventing further attacks from said attack source.

Claim 43 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 42, wherein said method of stopping said attack source is killing a user connection of said attack source.

Claim 44 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 42, wherein said method of stopping said attack source is sending a reset to said attack source.

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

Claim 45 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 42, wherein said method of stopping said attack source is blocking a SQL command.

Claim 46 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 42, wherein said method of stopping said attack source is intercepting and filtering a SQL command.

Claim 47 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 42, wherein said method of stopping said attack source is throwing an exception.

Claim 48 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 42, wherein said method of preventing further attacks is disabling an account from being used.

Claim 49 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 42, wherein said method of preventing further attacks is killing any future attempts from said attack source.

Claim 50 (withdrawn): A method for detecting attempts to inject SQL into a database application, the method comprising:

monitoring for SQL statements executable in said database application and intended to run queries not designed to be run by a middle-tier application;

analyzing said SQL statement's identifying characteristics indicative of SQL injection;

implementing an action upon detection of identifying characteristics indicative of SQL injection.

Claim 51 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 50, wherein said action is causing a security alert to be fired.

Claim 52 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 50, wherein said action is causing the SQL statement to be blocked.

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

Claim 53 (withdrawn): A method for detecting attempts to inject SQL into a database application, the method comprising:

listening to SQL queries executable on said database application for a determined period of time;

tokenizing SQL statements into standard forms;

recording a combination and an order of tokens expected;

analyzing SQL statements received later to identify those that do not conform to said expected combination of tokens.

Claim 54 (withdrawn): A method for detecting malicious activity in a database application, the method comprising:

listening to SQL queries executable on said database application;

analyzing SQL statements by applying regular expressions to detect vulnerabilities;

sending alerts when an SQL statement matching a regular expression is discovered.

Claim 55 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 54, wherein said regular expression is designed to detect a buffer overflow in a call from SQL to a built-in database function.

Claim 56 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 54, wherein said regular expression is designed to detect a buffer overflow in a call from SQL to an operating system function.

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

Claim 57 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 54, wherein said regular expression is designed to detect an attempt to escalate privileges of a user in said database application.

Claim 58 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 54, wherein said regular expression is designed to detect an attempt to insert an SQL statement into a parameter of stored procedures.

Claim 59 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 54, wherein said regular expression is designed to detect an attempt to escalate privileges of a user in an operating system.

Claim 60 (withdrawn): A method for detecting activity which may result in cross-site scripting vulnerabilities, the method comprising:

monitoring for SQL statements executable in said database application;
actuating each batch statement in order to discover atomic SQL commands;
examining an atomic SQL command for HTML tags.

Claim 61 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 60, wherein said atomic SQL command contains an HTML tag.

Claim 62 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 61, wherein said HTML tag is unencoded.

Claim 63 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 61, wherein said HTML tag is hex encoded.

Claim 64 (withdrawn): A method for monitoring all activity for security auditing, the method comprising:

monitoring for an event generated by a database application;

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

actuating said event;

recording said event.

Claim 65 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises an SQL statement.

Claim 66 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises failed logins and successful logins.

Claim 67 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises incomplete attempts to access said database application.

Claim 68 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises DBA activity.

Claim 69 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises changes to a configuration.

Claim 70 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises enabling of application roles.

Claim 71 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises a method of granting, revoking, or denying permissions or privileges.

Claim 72 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises a utility event.

Claim 73 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 72, wherein said utility event is a backup command.

Claim 74 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 72, wherein said utility event is a restore command.

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

Claim 75 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 72, wherein said utility event is a bulk insert command.

Claim 76 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 72, wherein said utility event is a BCP command.

Claim 77 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 72, wherein said utility event is a DBCC command.

Claim 78 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises a server shutdown.

Claim 79 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises a pause.

Claim 80 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises a start-up.

Claim 81 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises an audit event.

Claim 82 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 81, wherein said audit event is an add audit command.

Claim 83 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 81, wherein said audit event is a modify audit command.

Claim 84 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 81, wherein said audit event is a stop audit command.

Claim 85 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 64, wherein said event being generated comprises use of extended stored procedures.

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

Claim 86 (withdrawn): A method for providing exceptions to security alerts, the method comprising:

monitoring for events generated by a database application;
filtering alerts raised that match a defined set of rules;
passing alerts not matching a normal definition of said defined set of rules.

Claim 87 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 86, wherein said defined set of rules comprises values for each field collected for each event.

Claim 88 (withdrawn): The method according to claim 86, wherein said filtering is matched by comparing values of each field with values defined in an exception.

Claim 89- 97 (cancelled)

Claim 98 (amended): A computer readable medium having code to perform a computer implemented method for protecting a database hosted on a server, comprising:

installing a console on a remote computer system for monitoring activity on the database, the remote computer system having a first tangible computer readable medium;

presenting the installed console through a user interface;

the user interface being displayed on a monitor;

registering a listener agent with the console; the listener agent being installed on the server hosting the database, the server having a second tangible computer readable medium;

establishing a secure connection between the console and the listener agent;

the console and the listening agent monitoring activity at an application level of the database;

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

configuring the listener agent with a first set of rules having a set of security attributes;

installing a collector agent to be in communication with the listener agent for collecting a plurality of database events;

deconstructing the plurality of database events into a plurality of atomic messages;

analyzing the plurality of atomic messages for compliance with the first set of rules;

executing compliant database events;

sending a signal to a console operator when a database event is not compliant with the first set of rules;

allowing a console operator to create exceptions to the first set of rules when signals are sent by the listener agent;

updating the first set of rules with the exceptions created by the console operator;

storing the signals received by the console operator in a data file residing with the console, in association with the second tangible computer readable medium.

Claim 99 (previously presented): The computer readable medium having code to perform the computer implemented method for protecting the database of Claim 98, wherein the step of analyzing further comprises the steps of:

determining whether the plurality of atomic database events include an executable SQL statement that exploits a buffer overflow vulnerability in the database;

preventing the executable SQL statement from executing.

Appl. No. 10/798,079

Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009

Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

Claim 100(previously presented): The computer readable medium having code to perform the computer implemented method for protecting the database of Claim 98, wherein the step of analyzing further comprises the steps of:

detecting whether an executable SQL statement includes an operating system call;

preventing the executable SQL statement from making the operating system call.

Claim 101(previously presented): The computer readable medium having code to perform the computer implemented method for protecting the database of Claim 98, wherein the step of analyzing further comprises the steps of:

determining whether an executable SQL statement contains a write operation to a data dictionary;

preventing the data dictionary from being written to.

Claim 102(previously presented): The computer readable medium having code to perform the computer implemented method for protecting the database of Claim 98, wherein the step of analyzing further comprises the steps of:

determining whether an executable SQL statement alters a set of auditing configurations existing on the database;

preventing the set of auditing configurations from being altered.

Claim 103 (previously presented): The computer readable medium having code to perform the computer implemented method for protecting the database of Claim 98, wherein the step of analyzing further comprises the steps of:

determining whether an executable SQL statement includes a write operation to a set of audit records existing in a log file;

preventing the audit records existing in the log file from being written to.

Appl. No. 10/798,079
Amdt. Dated June 22, 2009
Reply to Office action of December 22, 2008

Claim 104 (previously presented): The computer readable medium having code to perform the computer implemented method for protecting the database of Claim 98, wherein the step of analyzing further comprises the steps of:

determining whether an executable SQL statement includes an attempt by a user to obtain administrator access by changing a configuration file in the database;
preventing the configuration file in the database from being changed.